



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,602	11/25/2003	Takuya Tamatani	14539-004011	3400

26161 7590 07/31/2006

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

OUSPENSKI, ILIA I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1644

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/723,602	Applicant(s) TAMATANI ET AL.	
	Examiner ILIA OUSPENSKI	Art Unit 1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30-54, 84-108 and 138-162 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 30-54 and 84-108 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 138-162 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/383,551.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/25/03, 3/15/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment/remarks, filed 05/23/2006, are acknowledged.

Claim 1 – 29, 55 – 83, and 109 – 137 has been canceled previously.

Claims 30 – 54, 84 – 108, and 138 – 162 are pending.

2. Applicant's election without traverse of Group III (claims 138 – 162, drawn to a method of treating an inflammatory disease comprising administering a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:2) in the reply filed on 05/23/2006 is acknowledged.

Claims 30 – 54, 84 – 108 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b), as being drawn to nonelected inventions.

Claims 138 – 162 are under consideration in the instant application.

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) in the priority application USSN 09/383,551.

4. The specification on page 1, paragraph 1, should be amended to reflect the status of the priority applications USSN 10/301,056 and 09/383,551.

Art Unit: 1644

5. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 120 is acknowledged. The priority applications USSN 10/301,056 and 09/383,551 appear to provide adequate support under 35 U.S.C. 112 for subject matter claimed in the instant application.

6. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention *to which the claims are directed*.

7. Applicant's IDS documents, filed 11/25/2003 and 03/15/2004, are acknowledged, and have been considered.

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 138 – 162 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention.

Art Unit: 1644

The specification does not enable one of skill in the art to treat an inflammatory disease by administering the extracellular region of JTT-1 polypeptide (also known in the art as ICOS or AILIM), as claimed, without undue experimentation. Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required to practice the claimed invention are summarized in In re Wands (858 F2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). The factors most relevant to this rejection are the scope of the claim, the amount of direction or guidance provided, limited working examples, the unpredictability in the art and the amount of experimentation required to enable one of skill in the art to practice the claimed invention.

In evaluating the facts of the instant case, the following is noted: The instant claims broadly encompass methods of treating any inflammatory disease in any subject; however, no direction or guidance, and no working examples have been provided by the Applicant. At the same time, methods of treatment relying on manipulation of costimulatory molecules of the immune system, of which the instantly claimed JTT-1/ICOS/AILIM is a member, are highly unpredictable. For example, Blazar et al. (J. Immunol., 1996, 157: 3250 – 3259; see entire document, in particular, e.g. page 3257, column 2 first paragraph) disclose that issues such as tissue distribution, half-life, affinity and avidity obtained with various reagents targeting costimulatory molecules might prove to be highly important in achieving a therapeutic effect. However, any conclusion regarding the efficacy of CD28/B7 modulation on altering in vivo immune response should be interpreted in light of the specific reagent used (Blazar et al., see page 3257, column 2, paragraph 1). Therefore, there is no evidence that the animal model used in the experiments disclosed in the specification would be predictive of the therapeutic methods encompassed by the claims.

Pharmaceutical therapies in the absence of in vivo clinical data are unpredictable for the following reasons; (1) the protein may be inactivated before producing an effect, i.e. such as proteolytic degradation, immunological inactivation or due to an inherently short half-life of the protein; (2) the protein may not reach the target area because, i.e.

Art Unit: 1644

the protein may not be able to cross the mucosa or the protein may be adsorbed by fluids, cells and tissues where the protein has no effect; and (3) other functional properties, known or unknown, may make the protein unsuitable for in vivo therapeutic use, i.e. such as adverse side effects prohibitive to the use of such treatment. See page 1338, footnote 7 of Ex parte Aggarwal, 23 USPQ2d 1334 (PTO Bd. Pat App. & Inter. 1992).

In view of insufficient guidance by the instant specification and the lack of predictability of the art to which the invention pertains with respect to the JTT-1/ICOS/IL1M signaling pathway, undue experimentation would be required to practice the claimed methods with a reasonable expectation of success, absent a specific and detailed description in applicant's specification of the clinical protocols, and absent working examples providing evidence that the claimed methods are effective for treating any inflammatory diseases.

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. Claims 138 – 162 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory **obviousness-type double patenting** as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 7 and 10 – 15 of copending Application USSN 10/729,880, and claims 18, 21, 22, 25, 29, 31 – 33, and 36 of copending Application USSN 10/721,404. Although the conflicting sets of claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are obvious one in view of the other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

12. Claims 138 – 162 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1 – 7 and 10 – 15 of commonly assigned USSN 10/729,880, for the reasons set forth above.

Art Unit: 1644

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP Chapter 2300). Commonly assigned USSN 10/729,880, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications pending on or after December 10, 2004.

13. Conclusion: no claim is allowed.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ILIA OUSPENSKI whose telephone number is 571-272-2920. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571-272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1644


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ILIA OUSPENSKI, Ph.D.

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1644

July 25, 2006


PHILLIP GAMBEL, PH.D. JTD
PRIMARY EXAMINER
PC 1600
7/27/06